

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated July 6, 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11-19, 21, 23, 24, 26-33, 35, 37, 38, 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,405,060 (Schroeder et al.). Claims 5, 20 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schroeder et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,556,841 (Yu). Claims 7, 10, 22, 25, 36 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schroeder et al.

By the present response, Applicants have canceled claims 5, 20 and 34 without disclaimer. Further, Applicants have amended claims 1, 14 and 28 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-4, 6-19, 21-33 and 35-41 remain pending in the present application.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11-19, 21, 23, 24, 26-33, 35, 37, 38, 40 and 41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Schroeder et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Schroeder et al. discloses an improved user interface for a cellular telephone system subscriber unit, that includes functions related to a predictive keyboard input method, a word completion method, a distinctive signaling method, a secret message method, a message screening method, an improved scratch pad method, and a global search method.

Regarding claims 1, 14 and 28, Applicants submit that Schroeder et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, displaying one of the matching word completion candidates in a display for selection by a user, adding a word selected by the user to the dictionary including a plurality of word completion candidates, if the selected word exceeds a first predetermined number of characters, and if this word is not present there already, or where the user, when the candidate consists of a text string consisting of a plurality of individual words, selects the first candidate word in this text string by pressing a select key for a period shorter than a predetermined period of time, and the entire text string by pressing the select-key for a period longer than a predetermined period of time. The Examiner asserts that Schroeder et al. discloses displaying one of the matching word completion candidates at col. 6, lines 31-49. However, these portions of Schroeder et al. merely disclose displaying three words in response to a user entering three letters, on a portion of a display so that the candidate words are placed adjacent to associated soft keys 9. This is not displaying one of the matching word completion candidates in the display for selection by the user, as recited in the claims of the present application. Schroeder et al. clearly discloses that three words are displayed atop associated soft keys as candidates for selection by the user. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application recite one matching word completion candidate being displayed. Further, Schroeder et al. discloses keys that change as the text is being written presenting different characters after its probability to be the next character to be input. In contrast, the limitations in the

claims of the present application relate to handling of input of words where if a user continues typing, the candidate word is simply overwritten and there is no change in the result should the user miss the proposed word.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Schroeder et al. discloses adding a word selected by a user to a dictionary including a plurality of word completion candidates if the selected word exceeds a predetermined number of characters at col. 7, lines 31-55. However, these portions of Schroeder et al. merely disclose that the user can enter words into the dictionary tree that are commonly used by the user and that alternatively, that new words input by the user can be automatically added to the dictionary based on frequency of input of such new words. This is not adding a word selected by the user to the dictionary including a plurality of word completion candidates if the selected word exceeds a first predetermined number of characters, and if this word is not present there already, as recited in the claims of the present application. Schroeder et al. merely discloses a user manually entering a word into the dictionary or a word being entered into the dictionary based on frequency of use. Schroeder et al. does not disclose or suggest adding a word to a dictionary including a plurality of word completion candidates, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, Schroeder et al. does not disclose or suggest the adding of the word if the selected word exceeds a first predetermined number of characters.

In addition, Schroeder et al. does not disclose or suggest where the user, when the candidate consists of a text string consisting of a plurality of individual words, selects the first candidate word in the text string by pressing a select-key for

period shorter than a predetermined period of time, and the entire text string by pressing the select-key for a period longer than a predetermined period of time. In the §103 rejections of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Schroeder et al. does not disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. Therefore, since all independent claims have been amended to include these limitations, these §102 rejections have been successfully traversed.

Regarding claims 2-4, 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29-33, 35, 37, 40 and 41, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 14 and 28 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims. For example, Applicants submit that Schroeder et al. does not disclose or suggest where the candidates in the word completion directory include a plurality of text strings each comprising a plurality of individual words and derived from text messages stored in the communication terminal, or where the word completion candidates in the word completion directory are searched for matches when the number of key strokes to be interpreted exceeds a second predetermined number of key strokes.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Schroeder et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9, 11-19, 21, 23, 24, 26-33, 35, 37, 38, 40 and 41 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 5, 20 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schroeder et al. in view of Yu. Applicants have canceled these claims, therefore, rendering these rejections moot. However, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as they may relate to the independent claims that have been amended with these limitations..

Yu discloses implementing spelling error detection and correction for a two-way mobile communication device. The two-way mobile communication device has a display screen and a telephone type keypad with the characters mapped onto each key in a many to one fashion. When the end of a character string is indicated by the input of a termination symbol then that character string is compared to a plurality of character strings stored in a dictionary. If no match is found in the character string in the dictionary, then it is assumed that the character string is misspelled. Individual character elements of the subject character string are then systematically replaced by character elements mapped to the same key and then each combination is compared to the entries resident in the dictionary. Matching character strings are retrieved and presented to the user for examination and selection or, if so desired, the most likely matching character string can automatically replace the misspelled character string.

The Examiner admits that Schroeder et al. does not disclose or suggest a select key by means of which the user selects the first candidate word in the text string by pressing the select key for a period shorter than a predetermined period of

time, and the entire text string by pressing the select key for a period longer than a predetermined period of time, when the candidate consists of a text string consisting of a plurality of individual words, but asserts that Yu discloses these limitations at col. 1, line 55 - col. 2, line 7. However, these portions of Yu merely disclose pressing a key multiple times to select a character of interest, and that an error may occur from an intended key not being activated in a proper manner. This has nothing to do with candidates matching a key stroke sequence where a user, when the candidate consists of a text string consisting of a plurality of individual words, selects the first candidate word in the text string by pressing a select key for a period shorter than a predetermined period of time, and the entire text string by pressing the select key for a period longer than a predetermined period of time, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions of Yu merely disclose selecting a key on a keypad multiple times to select a particular letter. This has nothing to do with candidates consisting of a text string that includes a plurality of individual words or selecting a first candidate word by pressing a select key for a period shorter than a predetermined period of time.

Yu discloses pressing a single key a particular number of times that has no relation to a predetermined period of time, as recited in the claims of the present application. Moreover, Yu does not disclose or suggest selecting an entire text string by pressing the select key for a period longer than a predetermined period of time.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that neither Schroeder et al. nor Yu, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the

limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 14 and 28 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these claim be allowed.

Claims 7, 10, 22, 25, 36 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schroeder et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 14 and 28 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. For example, Applicants submit that Schroeder et al. does not disclose or suggest where a second predetermined number of keystrokes is four.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Schroeder et al. does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 7, 10, 22, 25, 36 and 39 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-4, 6-19, 21-33 and 35-41 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

U.S. Application No. 09/993,513

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (referencing attorney docket no. 1030.40907X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb
(703) 312-6600